DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 942 JC 900 410

AUTHOR Church, Roy A.
TITLE The Leadership Metanoia.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Lorain County Community College Leadership Workshop (Elyria, OH, August 28-30, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Behavior Theories; *Community Colleges; *Leaders; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Styles; Management Development; *Organizational Effectiveness; Sociocultural Patterns; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

An argument is presented that "leadership metanoia," (i.e., a fundamental shift of mind in relation to leadership) has recently taken hold in many parts of the country, with implications for leadership development at Lorain Community College (LCC) in Ohio. The first section of the paper reviews the work of the six behavioral scientists who exerted the principal influences on the teaching of leadership in 1969, suggesting that the confluence of behavior theory with the advent of the information age and international competition has created the impetus for new management styles. This section argues that successful leaders focus on augmenting traditional cognitive learning with affective learning. The second section discusses problems in defining leadership, describing basic assumptions about, and identifying important characteristics of successful leaders. This section describes the good leader as having great faith in, and respect for people; having the ability to allow for new means to be introduced to reach a particular end; and having the ability to disagree with an idea rather than a person. The third section describes themes emerging from "leadership metanoia" that are germane to institutions such as LCC, including the trend toward nonauthoritarian organizational structures; a growing commitment to a customer-orientation; and the adoption of a continuous improvement ethos. The final section discusses the challenges of applying "leadership metanoia" at LCC, which include developing a personal leadership philosophy, an organizational culture analysis, and a collective vision for the 1990s. (GFW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322942

LORAIN COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE
ELYRIA, OHIO

THE LEADERSHIP METANOIA

JC900410

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. A. Church

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Leadership Workshop
August 28-30, 1989

Presented by:
Roy A. Church, President

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE LEADERSHIP METANOIA

There is a leadership metancia afoot in the American culture which, I perceive, is important to Lorain County Community College and to all of us in leadership roles from at least two perspectives:

1. We all learn from the experience of others and apply that learning to our own situation; and

2. As a community college we need to be aware of significant developments in our community so that we can relate most effectively in meeting community needs.

My presentation is intended to share with you some of what I have learned from my study of this subject and, perhaps more importantly, to share what applications appear germane and transferrable to our developmental status at Lorain County Community College.

My approach will be:

1. to describe the leadership metanoia that appears to be taking hold in our country;

2. to share with you some definitions, descriptions and beliefs about the metanoic leaders who are emerging;

3. to identify the overarching themes of the metanoia for organizations like ours; and

4. to describe my perception of the challenges we face at Lorain County Community College and where I hope we can go from here.

A. The Metanoia.

Let me choose as a point of departure the year 1970 for two reasons. First, that was a period in which I was getting my graduate education in higher education administration and was first exposed to organizational development theories. Secondly, it represents roughly the midpoint between the shake-out surrounding WWII and the decade of the 1990's which we enter this year. These points provide a good context within which to describe the leadership metanoia which I perceive is taking place.

Hopefully, the term metanoia has stimulated your curiosity to want a definition. The word was used originally to describe John the Baptist's conversion from sin to God in biblical terminology. However, Dr. Peter Senge, who in the mid 1980's headed an MIT research effort called "the New Management Style Project," applied the term metanoia to describe what they discovered to be a fundamental shift of mind in relation to leadership and that is my usage in this context.

To describe the fundamental shift which is taking place, I will go back to organizational development and leadership theory as it was taught in 1970. The National Conference Board queried 500 companies in 1969 and found the six most influential behavioral scientists who had impacted their organizational development. Since these six are representative of the theorists influencing the teaching of leadership at the time, I share with you the National Conference Board description of each as follows:

1. The late **Douglas McGregor's** The Human Side of Enterprise (1960) is probably the most widely-read book in its field in this century. McGregor, a psychologist, college president (Antioch), and management professor at MIT, cut through jargon to describe two sets of contrasting "assumptions" about man and his relation to work. In consequence, "Theory X" (men are willful, lazy, capricious and in need of constant watching), and "Theory Y" (men like work, seek responsibility, are capable of self-control) have become part of management language. The latter theory, McGregor argued, more nearly corresponded to the evidence derived from research into human capability. Before his death in 1964, McGregor often lamented that Theory Y was commonly mistaken to mean "soft" management, when he in fact believed that high management standards and goals were implicit.

2. **Abraham Maslow,** unlike the others here, did not base his major work on studies of business organizations. A theoretical psychologist, he described in Motivation and Personality (1954) a "need heirarchy," suggesting that motivation proceeds up a ladder of human need. His ideas suggest that "a satisfied need is not a motivator," and that people do their best only in situations offering more than good pay and benefits -- a chance for growth and involvement. Maslow, a former professor of psychology at Brandeis University, was a resident fellow with the W. P. Laughlin Foundation.

3. **Rensis Likert** showed that an organization is a complex system in which leadership, motivation, decision-making, communication and control tend to vary together. Likert maintains that these can be measured, and over a stretch of time related closely to production and profit. He described four organizational model systems.

   Likert's "System 1" manager, a dictatorial type, might be said to hold Theory X assumptions; his "System 4" manager, who seeks group consensus, would probably believe in Theory Y. In New Patterns of Management (1961) and The Human Organization (1967), Likert suggested radical changes in stucture, behavior, and the collection and use of management data by those who would tap the full potential of their employees. A psychologist and sociologist, Likert directed the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research, where important work in changing business and other organizations was done.

4. **Chris Argyris** has been a prodigious writer and researcher on the effects of organization life on individuals and an advocate of efforts to build consistency between individual and organization goals. He was widely known for his work with T (for training)-groups and for developing new designs for organizational structures and administrative controls. A professor of administrative sciences at Yale University, Argyris was best known for Interpersonal Competence and Orgnaizational Effectiveness (1962) and Integrating the Individual and the Organization (1964).

5. **Robert Blake,** who with **Jane S. Mouton** wrote The Managerial Grid (1964), neatly integrated the research of Likert, Argyris, McGregor and many others into an easily-understood tool for analyzing and attempting to change organization and management styles, based on the balance between one's concern for production and concern for people. In Blake terminology, a "9,1" manager (low on people, high on output) looks much like a System 1 or Theory X type, while a "9,9" (high on people and output both) parallels System 4 or Theory Y. Blake, a former University of Texas psychology professor, headed a multimillion-dollar consulting firm.

6. **Frederick Herzberg** in Work and the Nature of Man (1966) confirmed and elaborated upon his earlier Motivation-Hygiene theory. Fringe benefits, working conditions, etc., are "hygiene factors," essential but not motivating. Responsibility, achievement, recognition and growth opportunities are the factors which motivate people to perform better. Herzberg was professor of psychology at Case Western Reserve University.

In the past twenty years, it is my personal observation that most American organizations, public and private, were not very successful in internalizing the principles or concepts embraced by McGregor's Theory Y or Likert's System 4 or Blake's 9,9 for maximizing the use of human potential. My assessment is that most organizations following WWII were authoritarian hierarchies which had functioned efficiently during the national emergency, but which succumbed to the vagaries of bureaucracy during the next 20 years. Bureaucracy tends to stifle the release of creativity and insidiously erodes the value of our organization's most precious resource - human potential.

In recognition of the wisdom of the old maxim that we should use data as a drunk uses a lamppost - for support rather than illumination, my contention that bureaucratic organizational structures and approaches emasculate human commitment is supported by a mid-1980's Public Agenda Forum study of American non-managerial work force attitudes toward their work. While these are self-reported results, they are illustrative of the point which we all recognize too well:

1. Fewer than 1 in 4 jobholders say they are currently working to their full potential;

2. Seventy-five percent (75%) said they could be significantly more effective than they presently are;

3. Close to 6 in 10 Americans on the job believe that they do not work as hard as they used to;

4. Over half said they do not put effort into their jobs above and beyond that necessary to hold onto it.

A University of Michigan study underscores the point concluding that the gap between the hours of work people are paid for and their productive time is widening. They concluded that it widened by 10% during the 1970's.

The point is that most of our organizations are structured as authoritarian hierarchies and operate as bureaucracies and there is plenty of evidence that people do not give their best in these settings. Well, you say, if the theoretical leaders who were most influencing management were espousing behavioral approaches which maximize human potential, why haven't we seen more of a shift until now? My contention is that, once entrenched, bureaucracy takes on a life of its own which is difficult to change. The macro example is the government of China which appears to be the accentuation of the phenomena.

Knowledge from behavioral theory alone concerning what changes in leadership approach and behavior appear necessary to maximize human potential has been insufficient to effect a fundamental shift in organizational operation. In the last twenty years, however, the advent of the "Information Age" and the resultant international competition has provided an impetus which is compelling enough, when combined with the theoretical underpinnings of Maslow, Blake, Likert, et al, to precipitate the fundamental shift of thinking, the metanoia, which is emerging. Nations who are beating the United States in international business competition appear to be achieving greater productivity (both qualitatively and quantitatively) through their human resources than are we. In a May 1989 article for Psychology Today, the so called "Father of Management," Peter Drucker offered a cogent analysis which is captured through these excerpts:

1. The critical point is that knowledge is rapidly becoming our true capital base and premier wealth-producing resource.

2. Top managers in the knowledge society may well come to resemble the conductor of a symphony orchestra, who cannot tell a French horn player how to play but whose "management" consists of focusing the horn player's own abilities on enhancing the orchestra's communal performance.

3. All of society's institutions - economic, governmental, cultural - all thus by necessity become far more egalitarian and dependent on individual responsibility, initiative and constant open communication between individuals, regardless of rank in organization.

4. Indeed, 20 years from now, the typical large organization will have no more than half the levels of management it has today and no more than one-third the number of managers.

5. Very few events have as much impact on civilization as a change in the basic principle for organizing work. Our social center of gravity is shifting, perhaps has already shifted, to the knowledge of the workers.

If this assessment is accurate, then it does not take much of a "leap of faith" to accept the notion of a fundamental shift in thinking about leadership, albeit, twenty years in gestation has been forced into motion as an outgrowth of the "Information Age."

Before describing my definition of leadership and the basic assumptions I make about leadership and leaders, I want to digress a moment to review how we learn about leadership because it reveals a fundamental notion which is contributing to the leadership metanoia. We have all studied Bloom's taxonomy in which he described the hierarchy of levels of learning in the cognitive domain.

As you recall, cognition is the development of both awareness and judgment. Bloom's hierarchy encompassed both as follows:

1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application or Transfer
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

Cognition describes left brain functions and is the basis for most of our western culture's formal learning, including learning about leadership. It has its roots in Athenian Academy described by Plato in his seminal work The Republic. In addition to describing the goals of the Academy, this book described Plato's formula for preparing the leadership of ancient Athens. It was cognitively beautiful and could have been written yesterday. It did not work, however, because it assumed that human behavior could be rationally, logically, and empirically controlled which did not allow enough for the element of sheer unreason in the "politics of human affairs." In reality, there is a major dose of irrationality in human behavior which results from the intuitive integration of all our past knowledge and our interpretation of our experiences. Joseph Krathwohl describes a hierarchy of the affective domain, which deals with feelings and emotions, in contrast to Bloom's cognitive domain. His affective learning hierarchy included:

1. Receiving - being open and attentive to our external environment, through feelings and emotions.

2. Responding - actively interacting with the external environment at the feeling and emotional level.

3. Valuing - recognizing through our emotions and feelings what is important to us.

4. Organizing a value system - putting those values in conscious order.

5. Developing a philosophy - internalizing the value system so that it becomes an inherent context from which our behavior flows.

In popular, contemporaneous jargon, these two types of learning are the basis for all of the current left brain/right brain study. The left brain deals primarily with rational thought and cognitive learning, while the right brain deals with intuition based on feelings and emotions.

In current leadership writing, Tom Peters underscored the importance of affective learning in his Leadership Abstracts article The 'Emotional Side' of Management. His references are in the business context but appear to be transferable to educational organizations as well, and his use of the term management is closely akin to leadership as I define it here. He noted:

1. At a recent seminar for a business school's executive program, I recounted some stories about workplace transformations. Each resulted from a dramatic increase in the involvement and self-esteem of front-line employees. I expressed astonishment at the apparently limitless skills of even older workers in union settings, once they were allowed to "own" (psychologically, that is) their 25 or 250 square feet of the workplace. I fumed at our detached, machine-like models of organization that are hindering such tranformations.

2. Management is not about administration. It is about empowering people on a basketball court or in a meat packing plant to achieve continous personal growth.

3. Effective leadership in quality improvement is moral, not statistical. Statistics, training for everyone, and systems are essential to quality improvement. But, more important, are care and love of the product or service. Quality is as much about aesthetics (design, for instance) and customers' perception as it is about technical specifications. To achieve matchless quality, management must be emotionally attached to the product and must pass on their enthusiasm to every employee, distributor and supplier - as well as customer.

4. Thoroughgoing "people programs" include progressive monetary incentives and brilliant training curricula; we are woefully deficient on both scores. However, more important are respect, trust, a sense of partnership between union and management where applicable, a belief in the virtually unlimited potential of every person, and a willingness to let go of debilitating controls. Specifically, we must realize, for instance, that superb training is not so much a button-down curriculum delivered in million-dollar classrooms as it is a commitment to lifelong learning at all.

Why have I dropped back to these fundamentals of learning, you ask? It's because I believe that the metanoia, the fundamental shift of thought about leadership, is founded in a renewed appreciation for affective learning in the leadership arena. The magic of this realization is that successful leaders today are striking a new balance between cognitive and affective learning. They are relying more on their right brain functions and are moving to the higher levels of affective learning: primarily those of establishing a conscious leadership value system and, ultimately, developing a new leadership philosophy. Reaching these levels frees leaders from the vagaries and trivialities of whatever is today's crisis

and provides a longer term context within which to apply generic leadership principles.

They provide a context for effective leadership in a world racked by exponential rates of change. And it is at this level of learning about leadership that I am convinced the metanoia is taking place.

B. Defining Leadership and Describing Basic Assumptions and Characteristics.

Defining leadership succinctly is a challenge. As Bennis observes, "leadership is like love in that everyone knows it exists but nobody can define it." Peter Drucker defines it as the "combining vision with action to achieve desired results." Tom Peters describes it as the "intensity, involvement, the ability to create and bring to life an inspiring vision, a belief in a product, and genuine enthusiasm, for the work of the front-line bench scientist or check-out clerk." Bennis and Nanus define leadership with the companion notion of power. "Power is the basic energy needed to initiate or sustain action or the capacity to translate intention into reality and sustain it. Leadership is the wise use of this power. Vision is the commodity of leadership and power is the currency." They further observe that "leadership seems to be the marshalling of skills possessed by a majority but used by a minority." Rouche, Baker and Rose in The Community College President as a Transformational Leader defined leadership as "the ability of an individual to influence the values, attitudes, beliefs, and actions of others by working with and through them in order to accomplish the college's mission and purpose." They contrasted leadership with management by defining the latter as "the ability to integrate the skills of people with technology - such as policies, procedures, systems and equipment - for the purpose of organizing those elements necessary to accomplish the college's mission and purpose." Bennis and Nanus too strike this contrast as we "manage things and lead people." Bass in The Leadership Factor defined leadership as "the process of moving a group (or groups) in some direction through mostly non-coercive means. Effective leadership produces movement in the long-term best interest of the group(s)."

The definition I have used is "the process of motivating others to initiate or change behavior which results in collective action toward achieving common goals." This definition has eclecticly evolved for me over the past twenty years and represents where I am at this point in my understanding about leadership.

Allow me to be so presumptuous and bold as to share my interpretation of the values and philosophical underpinning of the new balance which is taking place through this leadership metanoia. First, I will share a number of basic assumptions I make about leadership. The values shared later will only make sense if the assumptions on which they are based make sense.

1. I believe that leadership is a product of social interaction in the group process. That is, if we accept the definition that leadership is a process of motivating others to initiate or change behavior which results in collective action, then it follows that motivating others requires social interaction and represents a challenge in human

relations. It also implies people working in groups which warrants looking more closely at what motivates individuals to collective action within groups. The critical assumptions I make about the individual's function in the group process are these:

a. Individuals need to believe in the goals of the group and see some evidence that the goals are being achieved;

b. Individuals in a group need to belong, to feel respected and to enjoy a degree of security;

c. Individuals in a group are motivated by more responsibility, achievement, recognition and growth opportunities than they are by external rewards.

Another important assumption about groups is that they differ in degree, not kind. Groups may vary in size, complexity, formality and organization, but the basic dynamics of people working together toward common goals are essentially the same across groups - groups differ in degree, not kind. So, my first assumption is that leadership is, fundamentally, a product of social interaction in the group process.

2. My second assumption is that the extent to which a group accepts an individual's leadership initiative is determined by their perception of him or her, his or her motives, and his or her competency.

3. The leadership function may be widespread and diffused throughout the group. Dynamic groups have more than one leader. Many individuals within the group exert leadership for other members.

4. The leadership function is fulfilled by different individuals as the situation changes. A group uses the individuals within it who can assist in the solution of the problem confronting it.

5. Leadership and followership are interchangeable. The characteristics that make an individual a good leader also make him or her a good follower.

6. Active leadership is characteristic of groups that determine their own activities rather than having them externally imposed.

7. A prerequisite for leadership in a group is understanding and appreciating the goals, norms, and history of the group and the needs, motives, and aspirations of the group's members.

Peters and Waterman have popularized the concept of management by wandering around. They assume that the leader who wanders among the troops is much more likely to have an accurate fix on the goals, norms and history of the group and on the needs, motives and aspirations of its members. This leads to an assumptive corrollary which holds that, other factors being equal, the amount of leadership exerted by an individual is dependent upon the frequency of his or her interaction with other group members.

8. The final assumption about leadership is that the most important functions of leadership are goal setting, goal changing, and resolving conflict within the group. The latter is critical to achieving the former two. Goal setting and goal changing are functions of vision and vision looks at what could be. It looks at what the group could do to enhance the achievement of its mission and looks at what would fulfill the needs and aspirations of the group's members. Peter Senge describes vision as "the picture of the future you wish to create."

Based upon these assumptions, I will describe the leadership characteristics which I value most and believe most closely describe metanoic leaders.

1. These leaders are personally secure and have a great faith in people to grow. Consequently, they draw heavily on the ingenuity and creativity of others and surround themselves with the strongest people available. They know that leadership is like good jazz - it stresses the uniqueness and individuality of each player, but is always focused around a common melody.

2. These leaders have the ability to discern problems of means from problems of ends and focus their energies first on the ends. They recognize that there may be many means to an end and that a certain amount of immediate production must be sacrificed to assure an element of creative risk-taking to encourage exploration of new means.

3. They maintain the fine balance between getting the job done and being humane. They operate on the maxim that if people don't count day in and day out, in the long run they won't count at all.

4. They treat all people, from the president to the maintenance worker, with respect and dignity and realize that they can learn from anyone.

5. They are accessible and good listeners always on the lookout for good ideas, from their critics as well as from their friends.

6. They concentrate on what's right, not who's right. They never disagree with a person but learn to disagree with a person's ideas without attacking him or her personally.

7. They are quick to accept philosophical disagreements and work, instead, to achieve agreements on specific actions to achieve their goals. They realize that we cannot hope to logically argue the complexities which have led individuals to form a philosophical position, but we can manage to focus on the elements of a specific action.

8. Leaders are visionary. As T. E. Lawrence describes:

> "All men dream; but not equally
> Those who dream by night in the dusty recessess of their minds
> Awake to find that it was vanity;
> But the dreamers of day are dangerous men,
> They may act their dreams with open eyes to make it possible."

They create a focus, an agenda and they have an unparalleled concern with outcomes and results.

9. Leaders are "with it," they are aware, they are interested in people and they sense what people want and need. This contributes to their vision.

10. Leaders are predictable, consistent, and most of all, persistent and determined in pursuing their vision and goals.

11. Leaders are innovative, future oriented, pragmatic, competent, enthusiastic and committed.

12. They have a high tolerance for ambiguity and paradox. They can keep the "big picture" in focus even when circumstances appear hopelessly chaotic. The metanoic leaders see beyond the din and current frustrations and take solace in ultimate vision and goals.

13. Finally, metanoic leaders assiduously and persistently evaluate what has been accomplished and use the results of this evaluation to help set new goals or to change goals. They are obsessed with the vision of constant improvement and take joy in continual achievement. They measure their success in the accomplishments of the group and they flow confluently with the rapidly changing world.

C. **Overarching Themes of the Metanoia for Organizations Like Ours.**

There appears to be at least three overarching themes emerging from the leadership metanoia which are germane to an organization like ours. They are:

1. The trend toward non-authoritarian organizational structures and operations;

2. The adoption of a continuous improvement ethos; and,

3. A renewed commitment to being customer-oriented.

First, let's look at the trend toward non-authoritarian organizational structure and operations. The benefits of this trend are the improvement of the effectiveness and productivity of the human resources of the organization by adopting approaches which encourage, support and reward substantive decision making as close to the operational level as possible. If the leadership assumptions that I have described earlier are valid, then approaches which effectively involve people in determining how they accomplish their tasks and fulfill their roles within the organization will be significant motivators toward more effective performance for the organization.

A non-authoritarian organizational structure and operation does not imply a laissez faire administrative style where no one is held accountable for their performance. On the contrary, this philosophical shift implies carefully and consciously structured processes which encourage productivity and accountability in what are, perhaps, some more effective

ways. In this type of environment, the potential for an individual being able to align his or her personal motives and aspirations with those of the organization are greatly enhanced and the level of personal commitment and effort directed toward the achievement of the institutional goals is enhanced.

In fact, it may be useful at this juncture to highlight one of the fundamentally dysfunctional attributes of authoritarian, hierarchical structures - that is, the "please the boss" syndrome. The structure encourages and rewards each individual to focus on pleasing his or her boss rather than on moving the organization to fulfill its mission and to achieve its collective goals. The syndrome encourages internal competition among units rather than internal cooperation and collaboration towards ends which are greater than the individual or unit. The syndrome can politicize the organization and distort the focus on vision.

In contrast, non-authoritarian organizations, in the metanoic leadership style, work hard to enable each person and each organizational unit to focus on the overall vision and the collective goals of the organization and to align its formal and informal reward structure to encourage creative, collaborative efforts among all units involved in the process of achieving the end results. In this environment, cooperation, consultation, and collaboration become the culturally valued behaviors which produce consistently higher quality results.

One example from the private sector of the dramatic impact that this type of leadership approach can have on the effectiveness of the organization was offered by Dr. Larry Sherr at the May 1989 Baltimore Forum of the Association of Institutional Research. He described a Motorola plant outside of Chicago which was purchased by the Mishusta Corporation of Japan in 1982. At the point of purchase, the plant was producing approximately 1,000 TVs per day with a required repair ratio of 1.3 repairs per TV. The annual warranty costs were running $16 million per year and the plant employed approximately 1,000 direct production workers and another 600 people who were indirectly supporting the operation in some way. In the next two years, with the same union, the same direct production employees, about one-half the number of indirect support employees and six Japanese managers, the plant was producing 2,000 TVs per day with .06 repairs per TV, and warranty costs of $2 million per year. Not only did the plant achieve this turnaround with the same union and the same heterogeneous group of employees, including relatively uneducated assembly line workers, it effected this transformation without new equipment or technology. The leadership principles underpinning the introduction of a non-authoritarian organizational structure and operational approach had clearly been the independent variable.

Other examples reinforce this metanoic shift and we will address several of them over the course of this leadership workshop.

The second major theme of the leadership metanoia is the adoption of a continuous improvement ethos within the organization. Most of the impetus surrounding this theme has come from the internalization by Japan and some of our other international competitors of statistical evaluation methods

which, most simply stated, focus on the end results of any production process and continually evaluate the "upstream" production process components to identify problems which could be resolved to more effectively (at higher quality) and efficiently (at less cost) produce these results. The Japanese guru who pioneered these methodologies was none other than the American professor from MIT, Dr. W. Edwards Deming. The methodology he espoused was developed in the 1930's at AT&T and the Department of the Census and after WWII was introduced to the Japanese recovery by General MacArthur's staff. Japanese businesses were in some measure coerced to accept a new way of thinking about improvement at a time when American corporations were euphorically experiencing a world-wide monoply. The long-term difference in the approaches is unmistakable in production quality today. In fact, the Japanese recognize the company each year that has accomplished the greatest quality improvement in their products and services with the W. Edwards Deming Award. Deming, Juran, and other advocates of these methodologies are now sweeping American business as our nation's companies scramble for consultants to help them regain their competitive position.

Deming's key fourteen points are worth exploring in detail even though they were written primarily for manufacturing audiences. They are beyond the scope of this introductory presentation and will be the subject for later sessions.

The third major theme is a renewed commitment to being customer-oriented. Within the leadership metanoia there appear to be an amazing number of "rediscoveries." One of them is that all organizations which are in the business of selling something need to know who their customers are, what their customers want and need, and what their customers are willing to pay for. Education, and all the units which make up an educational organization, in many ways have something to sell to society or to the rest of the organization. Knowing who the customers are, what their needs and desires are, and what they are willing to pay for, is as critically important in education as in any other type of business.

Dr. George Johnson, President of the University of Kansas, was quoted by Dr. Sherr in his Baltimore Forum speech as describing a rising tide of dissatisfaction with American higher education. He said a growing segment of the general public believe that higher education is "overpriced, underperforming, and possibly corrupt." He further argued that this is why we are seeing a rapidly growing higher education enterprise evolving in the private corporate sector. During the decade of the 1980's the size of this education competition has grown prodigiously. Much of the corporate educational alternative has developed because of a perceived lack of responsiveness and effectiveness of higher education to meet the continuous education needs of an established work force.

These bell weathers need to be heeded before higher education finds itself in a stunning parallel with U.S. manufacturing of the 1970's. If we do not awaken to recognize the changing needs of our "customers," we may well find the next generation of Americans heading for Japan or West Germany for a "quality" college experience and relying on the companies employing them for their continuing education.

D. What Challenges and Applications Does This Leadership Metanoia Provide for Lorain County Community College?

While many of the challenges and applications which I see are self-evident to many of you at this point, it may be useful for me to enumerate my perceptions.

1. Personal Leadership Philosophy.

First, each and everyone of us should consciously and introspectively evaluate our own leadership philosophies and behavior against metanoic tenets of leadership as I have described them or as you have learned about them from your reading and other exposure. I purposely underscored the new balance between cognitive and affective learning about leadership in order to posture this challenge. Leadership starts with me as an individual, and, at the risk of sounding too "preachy," it is the place we must start to effect a leadership metanoia in our organization. Levels 3, 4 and 5 of Krathwohl's affective learning hierarchy are critical if we are able to establish an organizational alignment of our collective leadership philosophies which enables us to operate day to day on a basis of covenental relationships rather than within the "please the boss" syndrome. A covenant implies a contextual agreement against which specific operational decisions can be made without the burden of externally imposed, bureaucratic rules and regulations.

Perhaps, Werner Erhard's quote in Bennis and Nanus book, Leaders, says it better than I can. Erhard, the founder of EST Corporation put it this way:

"There is this place in people, where they are aligned, where they don't need to be told what to do; they more or less sort it out for themselves what needs to be done and where they can work in harmony with other people, not as a function of a bunch of agreements or contracts, but out of sense of harmony. It's something akin to what you see on a sailboat in a crew working together when one of the lines breaks. Very few, if any, orders are given and nobody waits for the other guy or nobody gets in the other guy's way - there's something about sailors in which there is an alignment, a kind of coming from the whole and nobody needs to give orders."

2. Organizational Culture Analysis.

The second challange I see is the need for a conscious, collective evaluation of the cultural values and underlying basic assumptions on which our organization currently operates for the purpose of identifying those which will reinforce or impede our progress toward a non-authoritarian leadership approach. As Edgar Schein in Organizational Culture and Change articulates, "culture constrains strategy." Therefore, we must analyze our culture and learn to manage within its boundaries or, if necessary, change it to support the leadership metanoia.

Schein enumerates five primary and five secondary mechanisms for cultural embedding and reinforcement which are worth listing at this juncture:

a. Primary Mechanisms:

(1) What leaders pay attention to, measure and control;

(2) Leaders' reaction to critical incidents and organizational crises;

(3) Deliberate role modelling, teaching and coaching by leaders;

(4) Criteria for allocation of rewards and status;

(5) Criteria for recruitment, selection, promotion, retirement and excommunication.

b. Secondary mechanisms:

(1) The organizational design and structure;

(2) Organizational systems and procedures;

(3) Design of physical space, facades and buildings;

(4) Stories, legends, myths and parables about important events and people;

(5) Formal statements of organizational philosophy, creeds and charters.

These provide a valuable structure within which to think through our challenge.

3. Developing A Collective Vision for the 1990's.

The third challenge is to develop a collective vision for Lorain County Community College for the 1990's. The time is right for us to review and refine our mission and purpose, to articulate what we value and what will be our operating style. The results of this process will provide us with a directional context upon which to build as we lead our institution to its next level of excellence in the 1990's.

4. Evaluation of Operating Procedures and Leadership Practices at the Organizational Unit Level.

During Phase I of the administrative reorganization plan, we committed to reevaluate the role of the academic division directors in light of the commitment to force substantive decision making closer to the operational level. This leadership workshop is the result of initial activities to undertake this task.

It is apparent that this need is as important in all areas as in the academic divisions. Therefore, we need to review and evaluate our operational decision making in all areas in the context of the metanoic leadership principles if we are to effectively create a non-authoritarian leadership approach. This will require looking at the decision making matrix among organizational units as well as within the units. We will need to reevaluate job descriptions, incentives, rewards and evaluation techniques. And, lastly, we will need to evaluate our program directions and organizational unit goals which contribute to the achievement of the collective vision and which function within the continuous improvement and customer oriented ethos.

5. Professional Development.

One of the critical assumptions of metanoic leadership is the continuous growth and development of people at all levels within the organization. Organizational unit leaders will have to be proactive in invigorating this commitment, modelling a continuous growth attitude and motivating people out of their "comfort zones."

In closing, it appears that we can learn a great deal from the leadership metanoia which is unfolding around us to address the needs of our College with a goal of achieving a new level of excellence in the 1990's. And in the process, we will not only move our organization forward, we will contribute to leadership metanoia which can improve our society. John Gardner says it well in the following quote:

"Leaders have a significant role in creating the state of mind that is the society. Most important, they conceive and articulate goals that lift people out of their petty preoccupations, carry them above the conflicts that tear a society apart, and unite them in the pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts.

wp

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
OCT 05 1990